FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

DECEMBER 19, 1914

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
DEC 22 1914
PERIODICAL DIVISION

Drawn by Nina E. Allenaer

Allenaer

Merry Christmas! Do you take *The Suffragist*?

Vol. II December 19, 1914 No. 51

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single Copies .....5 cents

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

Columbian Printing Co., Inc., Washington

35

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under act of March 8, 1879

News of the Week

Rules Committee Permits Vote on Suffrage Amendment

ON Saturday, December 12th, the Rules Committee reported favorably the House Resolution No. 514, providing for consideration of the suffrage amendment in the House of Represenatives, immediately after the consideration of the National Prohibition Amendment, set for December 22d.

The Immigration Bill

THE Immigration Bill has passed the House, it has been favorably reported from the Senate Immigration Committee and is now before the Senate with every likelihood of being passed in its present form.

As it stands, it denies the right of entry into the United States to all persons who rebel against their government to the extent of advocating the destruction of property; and it declares that any person who assists such an alien to enter the United States may be punished by a fine of $1,000 or six months' imprisonment, or both.

This provision was introduced as an amendment to the present bill by Representative Raker of California. It is aimed against English militant Suffragists, and against all the men and women in this country who believe that these Englishwomen should have the chance to tell America the circumstances explaining their rebellion against long years of civil and political injustice.

If the bill contains the Raker Amendment when it passes the Senate it will for the first time in the history of our country deny the right of asylum to political offenders.

Never before has our Government undertaken to be a judge of the methods by which the people of other nations fight for their freedom.

This bill would have forbidden the greatest men and women of history to land on our shores. It would shut out Kosciusko, Kossuth, Garibaldi, "Babushka," Carl Schurz, Parnell, O'Brien, La Fayette. It is a departure from our safest and oldest traditions of liberal thinking and acting.

Men, who control politics today, should make haste to throw out these vicious amendments before they dishonor our statute books. Women should win the franchise that they may have the weapon to protest against this co-operation between America and the tyranny of Europe.

National Defense Referendum

LAST week a resolution was introduced into the House by Congressman MacDonald, of Michigan, providing for the submission of the question of national defense to the men and women of the United States.

The MacDonald Resolution is in the nature of a substitute for the one introduced by Mr. A. T. Gardner, of Massachusetts. Mr. Gardner's resolution provides for the appointment of a commission of nine experts who will look into our military preparedness and make such recommendations as in its judgment may seem proper. Mr. MacDonald's resolution proposes that this military commission shall formulate and submit to the people three alternative projects for military and naval equipment, designed to carry out three alternative military policies.

These might be called the small, medium-sized and large military policies. The first would maintain the present force of the United States without substantial increase until the United States could take up with the European powers the question of universal disarmament or the creation of an international naval force.

The second policy would provide for the adequate defense of the United States and provide also for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine by means of treaties with the Central and South American nations, establishing a Pan-American naval police. The third policy would not only arrange for the defense of the country, but would be large enough to graduate American property rights in foreign countries. It would also maintain the Monroe Doctrine through action of the United States alone and without regard to the attitude of the other Pan-American nations.

The significance of this resolution to women is that the referendum proposed by it is to be submitted to the women of the country as well as to the men. Progressive legislators today are seeking to ascertain for their own guidance the opinion of women on momentous national issues. It is absurd that women should still be deprived of the right to express an opinion on ordinary political affairs.

Votes for Indians

IN a report sent recently to President Wilson, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior Department, recommended the enfranchisement, as speedily as is practicable, of Indians of all tribes.

"It would be better, far better," said Secretary Lane, in part, "to sever all ties between the Indian and the Government, give every man his own, and let him go his own way to success or destruction, rather than keep alive in the Indian the belief that he is to remain the ward of the Government.

"The way out is gradually and wisely to put the Indian out. Our goal is the free Indian. The orphan asylum idea must be killed in the mind of the Indian and white man. The Indian should know that he is upon the road to enjoy or suffer full capacity.

"It is my conclusion, after as intimate study as practicable of his nature and needs, that we should henceforth make a positive and systematic effort to cast the full burden of independence and responsibility upon an increasing number of the Indians of all tribes. *I find that there is a statute which significantly empowers the Secretary of the Interior to do this in individual cases. That authority is adequate. I intend to use such authority.*

"In 1830 the problem was how to get the Indian out of the way. Today the problem is how to make him really a part of the nation. The man who can do for himself is the man to be released. And he is the man who thinks not in terms of Indians' yesterday, but in terms of the Indians' tomorrow."

This Administration has power to free Indians and Filipinos, and they intend to use it. They have power, too, to free the womanhood of America, but this is a power they are too democratic to use.

Mrs. Frank Leslie's Will Contested

ALTHOUGH Mrs. Frank Leslie's will was allowed to go to probate without contest, almost immediately thereafter three suits were entered in the Supreme Court by three grandchildren of Frank Leslie. These base their claims on a verbal agreement said to have been made by their grandfather that if he did not survive his wife she was to consider one-third of the estate as hers to be disposed of as she chose and the remaining two-thirds was to be divided among his three sons by a former marriage, or among their children. Mr. Leslie's will is on file with the other papers of his wife, but no mention of any agreement is made in it.

Suffrage Group for San Francisco Fair

THE group of statuary called "The Suffragist Arousing Her Sisters," has been accepted by the Board of Artists of the Panama-Pacific Exposition. A fund is now being collected for its completion and transportation. This group represents the Suffragist sounding a trumpet call to her sisters. At her feet is Vanity, while prostrate before her is Degradation. Dozing at her side is Conventionality, and behind her the toil-worn figure of the Wage-earner. The sculptor is Miss Ella Buchanan.

Family Life and Family Incomes

MISS MARY SNOW, who is in charge of the research department of the Intercollegiate Bureau of Occupations, makes a very interesting statement in regard to the possibility of marriage for working men and women. She says:

"Figures given by the last United States Census show 55 per cent of the adult men of the country earn less than $500 a year. One of the tragic aspects of our modern life is the new economic condition which young men and women are facing today, and to which they are not sufficiently accustomed to adjust themselves.

"Scores of young men who felt they could not afford to marry and plunged into making money now fill the clubs and bachelor apartments of the city. Many of the girls, too, are loath to marry unless the young man is financially able to support them. So I say that unless these girls are willing to continue to contribute to the support of the home after marriage, there is small chance that many of them ever will marry."

And yet there are men and women in this country today who say that woman's place is the home; to give her the ballot would force her out of it!

Many Unmarried Women Are Subject to Income Tax

THE recent report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows one very interesting fact. Among the unmarried persons subject to the new income tax nearly one-half are women.

And yet these women were not permitted to have any voice in the passage of this law.

The Sunday Tea

IT has been announced that on Sunday, December 20th, the speakers at the Congressional Union Headquarters, 1420 F Street, will be Mrs. John Jay White of Washington, D. C., and Miss Anne H. Martin, president of the Nevada State Suffrage Association, and Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore, who has just returned from the campaign in Washington. All members and friends of the Union are cordially invited to attend.

The Rules Committee Takes Action

ON the first Saturday following the opening of Congress, the Rules Committee, by a vote of four to three, decided to report favorably Mr. Mondell's Resolution No. 514, providing time for action upon the Suffrage Amendment in the House of Representatives.

The committee allotted six hours for a debate on the Suffrage Amendment and slated it to follow immediately after the disposition of the National Prohibition Amendment, which is to be taken up and voted upon on Tuesday, December 22.

The following day, December 23, is "Calendar Wednesday," which is devoted, under the rules of the House, to the consideration of measures which are not privileged. The House will adjourn for the Christmas recess on December 23 and reassemble on Tuesday, December 29. The Suffrage Amendment will therefore probably come up for action on the latter date.

At the meeting of the Rules Committee, which formulated these plans, the following members were present: Mr. Henry of Texas, chairman, Mr. Pou of North Carolina, Mr. Cantrill of Kentucky, Mr. Goldfogle of New York and Dr. Foster of Illinois, Democrats; Mr. Lenroot of Wisconsin and Mr. Campbell of Kansas, Republicans; and Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Progressive. Those voting against the suffrage rule were Mr. Henry, Mr. Pou and Mr. Cantrill; those voting for it were Dr. Foster, Mr. Lenroot, Mr. Campbell and Mr. Kelly. Mr. Goldfogle abstained from voting.

Members of the Congressional Union were astonished to learn of the adverse votes of Mr. Henry, Mr. Cantrill and Mr. Pou. Only a week before Mrs. William Kent and Mrs. Gilson Gardner, members of the Executive Committee of the Congressional Union, had been pleasantly assured by Mr. Henry and Mr. Cantrill that they were in favor of reporting the suffrage rule. Mr. Pou has all along declared that he personally believed in the Federal Suffrage Amendment. Before the meeting of the committee on Saturday, the impression prevailed that the Democratic members of the committee, who had met several times for a private discussion of the session's program, had fully decided among themselves to allow the question of woman suffrage to come to a vote.

Congressmen in touch with the majority members of the committee declared that the four-to-three vote on the suffrage rule was a Democratic "arrangement." Mr. Henry was aware that Dr. Foster of Illinois would vote for the resolution, and that Mr. Goldfogle, who represents the state of New York, where suffrage organizations are powerful, would refrain from casting a vote. This enabled Mr. Henry, Mr. Pou and Mr. Cantrill to put themselves on record against action on the Federal Amendment in Congress while actually permitting such action.

The *Washington Herald* in reporting the decision of the committee to refer the suffrage amendment to the House, interpreted it in the following bold headlines: Democrats Hope to Pluck Thorn by Record Vote—Expect Cessation of Blanket Opposition by Suffragists in Next Campaign—look for Early Vote."

Woman Suffrage and Strategy

EVERYBODY knows that Mr. Wilson and the small group of men about him do assume full responsibility in the name of the party for what has been done and left undone in Washington. This means responsibility for the refusal to allow the woman suffrage amendment to come before the House of Representatives for debate and vote. * * *

But it is replied: * * * "If we oppose the Democratic Party for its refusal to act we become partisan." The obvious retort is: "Not at all." If the Democrats were defeated and the Republicans should come into power and repeat the same tactics, the next thing to do would be to take the field and defeat the Republicans and keep up the see-saw until the controlling party organization, under presidential or boss leadership, as the case may be, accepts the inevitable. The women do not become Republicans by opposing the Democrats. They help the Republican Party temporarily, using it as an instrument to obtain the vote, on the assumption that securing the vote is more important than the success or failure of either or any party. This is the most diluted milk for political babes that one can imagine.

Finally, you say that the issue of woman suffrage is "where it belongs, before the entire male electorate of this country," and is to be decided by the votes of men. The statement is not politically accurate. On the very narrowest calculation it is not before the "entire male electorate." In twelve states women vote. In thirty-six states where women do not have the vote, it is theoretically before the male voters, but only theoretically. In practical politics the power of the organization leaders to pass the word down to "the boys" to "swat the amendment," is fully equal to the power of the independent electors, and the organization leaders in all states have to take into account the exigencies of politics at Washington. The only way in which the issue could be left to the "male electorate" would be to abandon the work for a national suffrage amendment.

Assuming that it is not proposed to abandon the national movement, then the issue is not before "the entire male electorate, where it belongs." It is before the men and women in twelve states, and the men in the other states, or, to speak correctly, the party organization, and some of the men in the other states. One-fourth of the United States Senators, nearly one-sixth of the House of Representatives, and nearly one-fifth of the presidential electors come from suffrage states. No national party organization or national leader now dares to oppose woman suffrage on principle, except on the assumption that the women voters of the West do not have the intelligence to read the newspapers and are so spineless that they would vote for a party or leader that dared to tell them that they have no business with the vote, anyhow.

Obviously, the woman voters hold the balance of power in national politics, and if they are keen enough they can force all parties to take positive stand for woman suffrage in 1916. If the women of the West will think nationally and politically, they can, through the working power of marginal minorities, compel the passage of a national amendment, but only on the assumption that they will punish at the polls the party that refuses to go on record or that violates its pledge when it does go on record. If the representatives in Congress from the suffrage states inform the national organizations of their respective parties that the women voters are politically alert, then the organizations will have to take notice. Inasmuch as the passage of the amendment by Congress merely submits the issue to the states, the Congressmen from non-suffrage states will see no reason why they should endanger the national organization by refusing to lay the proposition before the country. Then the issue will be before the legislatures, *i. e.*, the party organizations, of the several commonwealths.

Such is the view taken by the Congressional Union, and friend and foe must admit the strategic strength of the Union's position.—Letter by Charles Beard to *The New Republic*, December 12, 1914.

Congressmen on Suffrage Methods

SUFFRAGISTS who should seek help of Congressmen on the way to win the vote would receive fearful and wonderful advice, according to a member of the Congressional Union who has been busy at the Capitol during the past week.

Congressman Henry, when last interviewed, stated that he believed, with the President, that suffrage should be won by states. "When you get enough states you can then force the national amendment."

"Is the prospect for suffrage hopeful in your own state?" he was asked.

"Not at all," said Mr. Henry, firmly. "After the agitation for state-wide prohibition in Texas, the governor-elect is absolutely opposed to the submission of any more constitutional amendments for some years to come. * * *"

Senator O'Gorman also believes without qualification in winning suffrage by amending state constitutions.

"But," said the Suffragist, "there are some states whose constitutions it is impossible to amend."

"Then," replied the Senator, "the only thing you can do is to go to work and get the state constitutions amended so as to be able to submit state amendments more easily. * * *"

Senator Kern expresses himself in favor of state action and state action only. When reminded of the hundred years' work and the hundreds of thousands of dollars necessary to win the separate state referendum campaigns, the Senator replied cheerfully: "Well, hard work is good for all of us. It will educate you ladies to work up these campaigns. * * *"

"You must win," the President himself has said, throwing with equal *sang froid* the burden of enfranchising the nation on the shoulders of the disfranchised, "three-fourths of the states. You can then force through the national amendment."

The interviewer went away ruminating on this program of sacrifice and effort, laid by the men of the nation on the women of the nation; and one question rose before her mind: "Why do they say they cannot support the federal amendment now because it would 'force' liberty on one-fourth of our states, and then tell us we must win thirty-six referendum campaigns in order to be *able* to force it on one-fourth of the states?"

To this question neither the President nor the Congressmen have as yet returned an answer.

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Donald Hooker, Md., Chairman Finance
Mrs. Mary Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Pa.
Mrs. Harriott Stanton Blatch, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Md.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Abigail Scott Dunniway, Oregon
Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn.
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Mary Hutcheson Page, Mass.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelsen, Ore.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, Cal.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Miss Mary E. Woolley, Mass.

National Headquarters—1420 F Street, Washington, D. C.

COLORS—PURPLE, WHITE AND GOLD

Senate Resolution 130, and House Resolution 1

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Introduced:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:

In the Senate: June 13, 1913, favorable report.
In the House: May 5, 1914. Reported without recommendation.

Discussed:

In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, demanded immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.
Made unfinished business, March 2, 1914.
Debated almost continuously from March 2d to March 19th.

Voted Upon:

In the Senate: March 19, thirty-five Senators in favor, thirty-four opposed, failing by eleven of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Reintroduced:

In the Senate: March 20, 1914, by Senator Bristow, of Kansas.

Reported:

In the Senate: April 7, favorable report.

Present Status:

In the Senate: On Calendar of Senate.
In the House: On Calendar of House.

PARTY RESPONSIBILITY IN THE HOUSE

THE *Washington Herald* (Dec. 14th) commented as follows on the belated report of the suffrage rule:

"That the action of the House Rules Committee Saturday in favorably reporting a rule requiring a record vote on the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment enfranchising women, will remove, in large part, a thorn from the side of the Democratic Party, is the hope of leaders in Congress.

"It is hoped that by permitting the question to come to a vote in the House the party will be relieved from the blanket opposition which it met in the fall campaign when all Democratic candidates were opposed by the women regardless of candidates' individual views on suffrage.

The record vote, which probably will be taken before Christmas, will permit each Democratic member who favors the proposed amendment to record himself, thus offering a strong weapon of defense in the next campaign.

"Moreover, as the party leaders will have given their followers an opportunity to express their views, and, supposedly, the views of their respective constituencies, the blanket opposition will be further stultified if attempted in the next campaign."

Undoubtedly the blockade of the Suffrage Amendment in the Rules Committee was broken down by the "blanket opposition" of suffragists to the whole Democratic party in the fall campaign.

The unfairness of the Democratic party leaders in refusing the "representatives of the people," as we still call them, even the opportunity to cast a vote upon woman suffrage, was indefensible; and the party responsibility for this unjust behavior was manifest. The Democrats controlled the Rules Committee, and if the committee smothered the Suffrage Resolution, Democrats alone were responsible.

The policy of holding candidates of the party hostile to suffrage, responsible for their party's record, in the states where women are politically strongest, has already been entirely justified. It has forced the suffrage question for the first time in the history of our country, to a vote in the House of Representatives.

But if the Democrats hope that by permitting this vote in the House, they will "stultify" the policy of holding their party responsible for the further stages of the suffrage amendment, they are making a grave mistake. The party as a whole is exactly as responsible for the treatmer of the suffrage amendment on the floor of th House as for its treatment in the Rules Commit tee. The party leaders control the House mem bers just as they control Committee member and by the same methods. The Democrats i the House take a common stand on importan measures, and the party view is binding on indi vidual members. Under certain circumstance permission is privately accorded individual Demo crats to vote against the party view, provided tha a safe majority for the Administration policy i known to be secure. Democratic members fron equal suffrage states, for instance, are permit ted to vote for equal suffrage; it would embarras the party in their constituencies if they could no do so; and meanwhile the party view is bound t prevail in Congress.

In this session the Democrats still possess two-thirds majority in the House. The fate o the suffrage amendment is absolutely in thei hands. It will pass next Tuesday if the Adminis tration sees in time the wisdom of supporting it it will fail if the Democrats continue their pres ent unjustifiable policy of dismissing it from national consideration.

Whichever policy they pursue, the women of America will clearly understand. If the party espouses suffrage, women will know to whom to attribute the enfranchisement of half the people. If the Democrats oppose it, women in the equal suffrage states will certainly not be deceived by the personal record of the Democratic equal suffrage Congressman, whose presence in Congress supports the party opposing the freedom of women and whose votes are merely a part of a general scheme designed to put the suffrage movement at the greatest possible disadvantage.

States' Rights Logic

IF woman suffrage is a matter for the states, why not refer it to the states?

Submitting the national suffrage amendment to the state legislatures is a democratic action, akin to the submission of women suffrage by the state legislatures to the voters.

It should be impossible for a Democratic administration to refuse such action, in the face of a national demand.

Results of the Election Campaign

AS the proof of the pudding is in the eating, so we believe that the value of the pre-election campaign conducted by the Congressional Union in the equal suffrage states will be found in its results.

Recognizing the fact that favorable action by Congress on the Bristow-Mondell amendment was impossible so long as the Democratic party continued actively to oppose it, the Congressional Union sent organizers into each of the equal suffrage states to ask the women voters to withhold their support from the Democratic candidates for Congress until that party abandoned its persistently obstructive attitude.

The campaign in the equal suffrage states was conducted by Miss Jane Pincus and Miss Josephine Casey, in Arizona; Miss Lucy Burns and Miss Rose Winslow, in California; Miss Doris Stevens and Miss Ruth Astor Noyes, in Colorado; Mrs. Helena Hill Weed, in Idaho; Mrs. Edna S. Latimer and Miss Lola Trax, in Kansas; Mrs. Jessie Hardy Stubbs and Miss Virginia Arnold, in Oregon; Miss Elsie Lancaster, in Utah; Miss Margaret Whittemore and Miss Anna McCue, in Washington, and Mrs. Gertrude Hunter, in Wyoming.

Without pausing to discuss the system of party responsibility in this country—a system not created, it may be observed, by the Congressional Union but merely accepted by it as the incontrovertible fact, a study of our government or experience in dealing with it will equally prove it to be,—we will consider only the results of our campaign as shown in the light of subsequent events.

In estimating these results, it must be borne in mind that the intention and endeavor to defeat or to reduce the majorities of the Democratic candidates for Congress in the equal suffrage states was but a means to an end, and not the end itself. The object was not the destruction of the Democratic party, but the awakening of the party to a realizing sense that continued opposition to the proposed amendment enfranchising women would inevitably alienate votes and weaken the support enjoyed by that party in the equal suffrage states.

The extent, then, to which the question of national women suffrage was for the first time made a prominent political issue in a national election and the record of the Democratic party thereon brought before the voters, with the result that the candidates of that party suffered defeat or a reduction of their majorities, may fairly be considered the measure of success of the Congressional Union's election campaign.

There should also be taken into account the establishment of headquarters and the greatly increased membership of the Congressional Union in the equal suffrage states, all of which makes possible even more successful future campaigns, should they be necessary.

Arizona

Senator: *M. A. Smith* (*Dem.*), Re-elected
Representative: *Carl Hayden* (*Dem.*), Re-elected

THE first and most striking effect of the invasion of Arizona, a strongly Democratic State, was the action taken by Senator Smith and Representative Hayden, Democratic candidates for re-election, in telegraphing from Washington to the State Convention in session in Phoenix, asking it to put a national woman suffrage plank in the Democratic platform and pledging themselves "to vote at all times for national woman suffrage."

Viewed in the light of the known fact that both men had opposed the granting of woman suffrage in their state, and that Senator Smith had absented himself from the Senate when the vote on the Suffrage Amendment was cast, this unexpected interest so suddenly evinced was both gratifying and significant.

A few days later, Representative Hayden rose in the House and delivered a speech on the subject of women suffrage and his attitude thereon which filled three pages of the *Congressional Record*, and with copies of which the state of Arizona was flooded in the days preceding the election.

Coming to the election figures, we find Senator Smith re-elected by a majority so small that it was nearly a week before the fact of his election was definitely known.

California

Senator: *James D. Phelan* (*Dem.*), to succeed *George W. Perkins* (*Rep.*)

Four Democrats, three Republicans, three Progressives and one Independent to succeed three Democrats, four Republicans, one Progressive, one Independent and two Progressive Republicans.

IN this state a Democrat defeated a Republican for the Senate, and four Democrats were elected to the 64th Congress, all five candidates winning by large majorities.

This result, which on its face would seem to indicate the utter failure of our pre-election campaign, was due to the divided opposition to the Democratic Party, an opposition which did not exist two years ago, the Progressives at that time having fused with or "captured" the Republicans.

Here also national woman suffrage was made a prominent political issue. The Progressive candidate for United States Senate repeatedly emphasized his support of the federal suffrage amendment. The Republican candidate circularized the state with literature of his own, dealing with the obstructive tactics of the Rules Committee. The Congressional Union organizers stumbled on Democratic campaign orators in small country towns defending the record of their party on woman suffrage, and found in calling upon the editors of Democratic and Republican newspapers throughout the state, that they had been fully informed by their party headquarters of the work and purpose of the Congressional Union. It is safe to say that but for the Congressional Union campaign, national woman suffrage would not have been mentioned in California.

At the conclusion of the campaign, permanent headquarters were left in San Francisco, and plans laid for organizing in California throughout the Exposition year.

Colorado

Senator: *Charles S. Thomas* (*Dem.*), Re-elected
Representatives: Three Democrats and one Republito succeed four Democrats

IN Colorado, Senator Thomas won by a majority so small (3,309) that its existence was in doubt for five days following the election. In 1912 he was elected for a short term by a plurality of 45,006. The Democratic representation in the House was reduced by one, through the defeat of Representative Seldomridge (Dem.), in whose district the activities of the Union's organizers were concentrated. The majority of Congressman Keating, an exceptionally strong candidate, was reduced from 45,580 to 4,624.

That the Union was admittedly a factor to be reckoned with was shown by the action of the Democratic State Committee in issuing a special pamphlet just before election, dealing exclusively with the points raised by its organizers, and attempting a defense of the party record on the suffrage issue so unexpectedly injected into the campaign.

All three parties incorporated into their state platforms, for the first time in the history of Colorado, a plank favoring the National Suffrage Amendment.

The headquarters established at Denver has been made permanent, Miss Ruth Astor Noyes remaining in charge, and active work aided and supported by the women of Colorado is being done to strengthen and organize the sentiment in the state in behalf of national woman suffrage.

Idaho

Senator: *James H. Brady* (*Rep.*), Re-elected
Representative: Two Republicans to succeed two Republicans

ONLY one organizer was sent into Idaho, a state which was reasonably certain to and did elect Senator Brady and Representatives McCracken and Smith, all Republicans.

Senator Brady's election, however, was unexpectedly jeopardized through the feeling roused against the Republicans in Idaho by the embezzlement of funds by the State Treasurer, a Republican officeholder. He had, also, a strong antagonist in his opponent, Governor Hawley, who had defeated him in the gubernatorial contest four years before.

Had it not been for the opposition roused against the Democratic candidate by the Congressional Union campaign based on the suffrage record of the Democratic Party, Governor Hawley might have compassed the defeat of Senator Brady. As it was, the Republican candidate was returned, and the two Republican candidates for the House of Representatives were elected with large majorities.

Kansas

Senator: *Charles A. Curtis* (*Rep.*) to succeed *Joseph L. Bristow* (*Rep.*)
Representatives: Two Republicans and six Democrats to succeed two Republicans and five Democrats.

IN this state, effort was concentrated on the senatorial contest, with the result that Representative Neeley, the Democratic candidate, was defeated.

Representative Neeley's election had been regarded as a practical certainty, owing to the presence in the field of two opposition candidates, former Senator

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.
Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York
SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

Curtis, who had received the Republican nomination, and Representative Murdock, a powerful Progressive candidate.

It is generally conceded that the campaign conducted in Kansas by the two organizers sent into that state by the Congressional Union was the determining factor in the defeat of the Democratic candidate for the Senate. The Democratic papers were vehement in their editorial denunciation of the women who had dared to "bring woman suffrage into politics" by exposing the record of the majority party thereon. Representative Doolittle, after vainly urging the chairman of the Union to withdraw the two organizers from Kansas, or at least to refrain from entering his district, delivered a speech in the House which covered nearly two pages of the *Congressional Record*. Copies of this speech defending his own position and attacking the policy of the Union were sent not only into his own district but were used extensively throughout the state.

More than 50,000 pieces of literature were distributed by the two organizers, speeches were made in every town and city and throughout the country districts, and Democratic candidates were forced to confront at every turn the record of their party on national woman suffrage, an issue which otherwise would not have entered into the campaign.

Oregon

Senator: *George E. Chamberlain* (*Dem.*), Re-elected
Representatives: Three Republicans to succeed two Republicans and one Progressive Republican.

IN Oregon the entire state was covered in the pre-election campaign by the two organizers sent into that state, and national woman suffrage made a dominant issue.

Senator Chamberlain promptly had issued a new and enlarged series of posters on which his suffrage record made its appearance as his chief appeal for election. It was recognized that the return of Senator Chamberlain was more than probable; but, widely known and popular as he is, he was forced to realize as never before the necessity for satisfying criticism of the Administration for its unfortunate record on woman suffrage. He repeatedly asserted his non-partisanship, asking for election as a non-partisan rather than as a Democrat, and it remained for the organizers of the Congressional Union to inform his constituents that he had with one exception voted consistently as a Democrat and in support of that party in the Senate.

In the Third District, the defeat of Flegel, Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives, was admittedly the result of the campaign of the Congressional Union. The wife of an Oregon Congressman, lamenting the opposition of the Congressional Union to Senator Chamberlain, said last week of the Oregon organizers, more in sorrow than in anger—"And they defeated Flegel!"

The headquarters established at Portland has been made permanent, Miss Virginia Arnold remaining in charge to direct the work in Oregon.

Utah

Senator: *Reed Smoot* (*Rep.*), Re-elected
Representatives: One Republican and one Democrat to succeed two Republicans.

ONLY one organizer went into Utah.

The Democrats ran a candidate for only one seat in Utah, the senatorial seat; and the organizer therefore worked only in the senatorial contest. The Progressives and Democrats fused in Utah, the Democrats taking the nomination for the Senate, while the Progressives took the House nominations.

This coalition of opponents gave Senator Smoot a hard fight, and the suffrage campaign conducted there undoubtedly contributed to the defeat of the Democratic candidate for Senator.

The two men who were running for the House on the fusion arrangement announced that if elected they would sit in the House as Progressives and vote as Progressives, and would not be members of the Democratic caucus.

Washington

Senator: *Wesley L. Jones* (*Rep.*), Re-elected
Representatives: Four Republicans and one Democrat to succeed three Republicans and two Progressives.

IN this state the campaign conducted by the Congressional Union organizers was admittedly a factor in the defeat of the Democratic candidate for the Senate.

Effort was concentrated in the First, Second and Third Congressional Districts, in all of which the Democratic candidates were defeated. A Democrat was elected from the Fourth and a Republican from the Fifth District to replace in the House of Representatives the two Progressives who had taken their seats as Representatives at Large in the 63rd Congress. Both the Fourth and Fifth Districts are considered to have normally Democratic majorities, and the election of the Republican candidate in the Fourth District was looked upon as a decided victory. The successful Democratic candidate in the Fifth District followed the Congressional Union organizer from point to point, and at the conclusion of her speech asked for recognition and promptly proceeded to pledge himself in the most binding terms to support and vote for the federal amendment. "Ole" Hansen, Progressive candidate for the United States Senate, had the National Suffrage Amendment put as a heading on all his stationery. Everywhere the question of national woman suffrage was brought prominently to the front.

Wyoming

Senator: (None to be elected.)
Representative: *Frank W. Mondell* (*Rep.*), Re-elected

ONLY one organizer was sent to Wyoming, generally regarded as a normally Republican state. There was no Senatorial campaign, and effort was therefore concentrated on assuring the defeat of the Democratic candidate for the House of Representatives and in covering the state with literature explaining the status of the Federal amendment in Congress and the record of the Democratic party on that measure. The organizer worked principally in and around Cheyenne, covering the territory within 100 miles by automobile trips, and the state at large by means of circulars and daily press bulletins. Here, the local women responded with enthusiasm to the appeal of their eastern sisters for help in their struggle for enfranchisement. The Democratic papers recognized the effective nature of the Congressional Union campaign by editorial attacks upon its organizer and her work more vituperative in tone than those appearing in the Democratic organs of any other state.

A FRIENDLY critic of the Congressional Union tells us: "The Democratic gains in suffrage states are in striking contrast to the losses in non-suffrage states." But this is unfair comparison. The western states which are mainly agricultural, cannot be well compared with industrial states of the East where the tariff question was an overwhelming issue. To compare results in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and so on, with results in such states as New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, is manifestly inconclusive as a basis for judging the effect of political work done by any organization in those states.

The campaign of the Congressional Union accomplished exactly what its members hoped and expected that it would accomplish. If their purpose had been merely to unseat Democrats, they would of course have taken the districts in the United States where the Democrats had won by very slight majorities. When they went into a rock-ribbed Democratic state like Arizona, they did not anticipate that they would unseat either of the Democratic candidates of that state. Neither did they expect to unseat any of the Democratic candidates from such a strongly Democratic state as Colorado. If the Congressional Union, moreover, had been merely intent on punishing Democrats it would not have gone into such strongly Republican states as Idaho, Wyoming and Utah. Their purpose in going into these states was to make woman suffrage a political issue—for all time, until women are enfranchised—in the states where women have political power, and to lay the foundations there for permanent and constantly growing support of the suffrage work at Washington. They succeeded in making the record of the Democratic party (an issue which would not otherwise have been heard of), widely known and hotly discussed in the suffrage states.

They gained, even in the thick of the election contest, hundreds of members and left three organizations to continue the campaign in behalf of national woman suffrage. They brought into touch with the work for national woman suffrage women prominent in their own states—women like Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, of California, Mrs. Lauritz Therkelsen, of Oregon, Miss Margaret Roberts, of Idaho, and Dr. Vena Jolidon-Croake, of Washington. An immense amount of publicity for the national suffrage amendment was secured in these few weeks, especially in Kansas, Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming and Oregon.

To sum up:

Basing our estimate on the charges made by friends of the candidates we were forced through the action of their party to oppose, the Congressional Union campaign accomplished the defeat of Representative Neeley, of Kansas, contributed in large measure to the defeat of Governor Hawley, of Idaho, and Mr. James H Molye, of Utah, and greatly affected the majorities of Senator Smith, of Arizona, and Senator Thomas of Colorado. They failed to influence the election of Senator Chamberlain of Oregon, and Mr. Phelan, of California.

Our campaign was admittedly the determining factor in the defeat of two candidates for the House of Representatives, Representative Seldomridge, of Colorado, and Mr. Flegel, of Oregon; contributed in large measure to the defeat of Mr. Roscoe Drumheller, of Washington, and greatly reduced the majority of Representative Keating, in Colorado.

The immediate effect was the action of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives in reporting favorably on the resolution of Representative Mondell providing for consideration by the House of the resolution introduced by him proposing a constitutional amendment enfranchising women. This resolution was reported to the House without recommendation by the Judiciary Committee on May 5th last, but action upon it has been prevented by the failure of the Rules Committee to allot time for its consideration.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
SUITS
COATS
J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.
Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York
BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS
WRAPS
FURS

Comments of the Press

CONGRESS MUST VOTE FOR WOMEN OR AGAINST WOMEN

The Time for Quibbling and Evasion Has Passed, So Has the Coward's Opportunity to Run Away from the Issue.

IN a few days the National House of Representatives must declare itself on woman suffrage.

Every effort of cowardly politicians to shift and dodge has failed. There is still an echo of Mr. Wilson's declaration that the states should settle the question, *but every Congressman knows that if he fails to support the Mondell amendment, he can be justly charged with enmity to suffrage.*

A few years ago the question of whether women should continue to be classed with infants and idiots was not even an issue. The speech of every little politician asked to talk on suffrage was filled with the threadbare platitudes about woman's place being in the home, and why give votes to women when they cannot fight for their country?

Since then conditions have changed very rapidly, and Congressmen, being on the payroll of the country because of their ability to follow public sentiment, have begun to wake up to what is going on.

Impatient of waiting for national action, no less than twelve states, with ninety-one *electoral votes,* have decided that women are just as well fitted to vote as men.

Without smashing any windows, or setting fire to any churches, or horsewhipping Mr. Bryan or any other member of the Cabinet, women have convinced State legislatures of their intelligence and ability.

In the states where they have secured the ballot conditions have been bettered. They have held office wisely and honestly.

And by continuous and unremitting efforts they have kept their cause before the public, until there is now no doubt that a majority of the citizens would give them the ballot, if the opportunity were offered.

A large number of Congressmen, too dull to understand anything that happens outside of Congress or of ward political meetings, still believe that they can put off the day when the American home shall have a voice in American government.

By delay and parliamentary juggling they have put off a vote time and again, but they can put it off no longer.

* * * * * * * *

The Mondell amendment will come up in a few days. It will be backed by the intelligence of the whole country, because it is the simplest and the quickest way to bring about woman suffrage.

It will deprive little State bosses of the right to say that their henchmen are more intelligent than the mothers who reared and taught and made the able men of the country.

It will force the issue in every State Legislature when it comes up for ratification. Without a national amendment local bosses, still holding their grip on the legislatures, might continue for years to prevent the people from voting on the question.

* * * * * * * *

The brave and patient women who have taken their case to Washington have had real encouragement in the Senate—none whatever from the White House, where the State rights argument was coldly offered them by Mr. Wilson.

The House of Representatives will have a real opportunity when the amendment comes up. And its members will be judged not alone by the women, but by the whole country, on their votes.—*The New York Evening Journal,* December 16, 1914.

SEEIN'. THINGS.

By the courtesy of the New York World Dec. 14th., the leading Democratic organ of the country

DEMOCRATS HOPE TO PLUCK THORN BY RECORD VOTE

Expect Cessation of Blanket Opposition by Suffragists in Next Campaign

LOOK FOR EARLY VOTE

THAT the action of the House Rules Committee Saturday in favorably reporting a rule requiring a record vote on the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment enfranchising women, will remove, in large part, a thorn from the side of the Democratic Party, is the hope of leaders in Congress.

It is hoped that by permitting the question to come to a vote in the House the party will be relieved from the blanket opposition which it met in the fall campaign when all Democratic candidates were opposed by the women regardless of candidates' individual views on suffrage.—*The Herald,* Washington, D. C., December 14, 1914.

The President's Attitude Toward Suffrage

LAST June President Wilson said he was "impressed" with the demand made by women for the vote. Since the election he has written to Mary M. Childs, a government employe, and announced himself as "deeply impressed."

As a barometer indicating progress, President Wilson is not without value to the suffrage movement.—*The New York Call,* December 13, 1914.

Over Half of the People in Washington
EAT CORBY'S BREAD--WHY?

Treasurer's Report

THOSE who have been so loyally supporting the Federal Suffrage Amendment must be glad that they have had a part in securing a vote on the amendment in the House. But this is only one step, though a very encouraging one, in the work yet before us. Do you wish to give courage to those who are bearing the brunt of the fight? Then let them know that they have your backing, your interest. The suffrage cause in America has before it a great political opportunity; what we need,—what every movement needs if it is to succeed,—is funds. Are you anxiously awaiting the freedom of women, is that a thing about which you care a very great deal? If it is, then let me tell you a story.

There was once a poor man whose sole means of livelihood was a decrepit horse. One day the old beast heaved a sigh, rolled over on the pavement and breathed his last. Of course, a crowd gathered quickly, and many were the expressions of sympathy for the owner. Finally one of the men who had been standing quietly looking on, stepped forward and said: "All of you men seem to care a great deal because this good man has lost his horse. Now I care five dollars worth. How much do you care?"

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD $100,000 FUND FOR SECURING THE PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

(*Fund opened December 7th, 1912. Donations, membership fees and tickets are here listed; receipts from the purely business departments of "The Suffragist" and the Literature Committee are not included.*)

LIST OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DECEMBER 7th THROUGH DECEMBER 14th, 1914

Mrs. George Odell	$2.00
Mrs. William Kent	45.00
Mrs. Harriet L. Scribner	1.00
Mrs. Minnie E. Brooke	4.52
Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore	.50
Miss Mary Conkle	2.50
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles	2.00
Mrs. J. F. Thomas	34.00
Mrs. Lucretia M. P. Mitchell	5.00
Mrs. Walter W. Carter	25.00
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice	10.00
Cash	50.00
Membership fees	12.00
Sale of tickets	6.00
Total	$199.52
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	50,825.17
Total to December 14, 1914	$51,024.69

NOTICE In establishing the Crown Circuit of Picture Theatres to aid equal suffrage, we require women managers. Correspondence solicited.
COOPERATIVE PHOTOPLAY SYNDICATE
General Agency
Hotel Calvert, Broadway and 41st, New York City

Headquarters for Suffragist Photographs
CLINEDINST
STUDIO
733 Fourteenth St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Ground Floor (No Steps) Phone Main 4932-4933

COPENHAVER
Society Engravers and Stationers
UPTOWN STORE
1521 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
Telephone, North 475

1000 New Subscribers

ONE of our members, in sending in a new subscription to the *Suffragist,* writes: "The paper is so wonderfully interesting. I always think the last is the best." Another member writes: "The *Suffragist* is thrilling enough to move a stone."

We ask everyone to help in spreading the paper. It is the easiest and surest way to win permanent supporters for the Federal Amendment work.

MEMBERS WHO HAVE SECURED NEW SUBSCRIBERS

DECEMBER 8th TO DECEMBER 14th

(*In this column we list the subscribers sent in each week by our members. These are only a part of the total number of new subscriptions.*)

Miss Sara Crowell	3
Miss Rachel S. Howland	4
Miss V. J. Arnold	1
Miss Gertrude Crocker	1
Miss Ingeborg Kindstedt	1
Miss Elizabeth Smith	1
Miss Mary Swain Wagner	1
Miss Marie Goucher Greene	1
Miss Elizabeth Fairall	2
Mrs. George H. Day	1
Miss Alice Paul	1
Miss Helen Munroe	1
	17
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	422
Total to December 14th	439

A Christmas Gift

HAVE you a friend who has not yet renewed her subscription to *The Suffragist?*

AND are you trying to decide upon a Christmas gift for her?

THEN there is at least one name you can check off your Christmas list today.

LET your gift be a year's subscription to *The Suffragist.*

SEND in your check now, and we will send you a beautiful Christmas subscription card in its own envelope ready for mailing.

YOUR friend will receive it on Christmas morning, and every week during the coming year the *Suffragist* will bring to her the news of the great and growing movement for the national enfranchisement of women, and the memory of your thoughtfulness and love.

Holiday Gifts
In Fine Leather Wares at
Wonderful Variety to Select from
TOPHAM'S
1219 F Street

MAYER BROS. & CO.
937 and 939 F Street N. W.
LADIES' SUITS, COATS AND MILLINERY

For Purity and Wholesomeness, Insist on
"The Velvet Kind"
ICE CREAM
'Tis Made in the Most Scientific and Sanitary Ice Cream Plant in the World
CHAPIN-SACKS MANUFACTURING COMPANY

A Merry Christmas
Means a cheery business—a prosperous business: if *your* business lags *try some good printing—original composition*—use printing that "talks." Place your next order with C-P-Co. and get the "cheery habit." *We Grow 'Cause We Know*
COLUMBIAN PRINTING COMPANY, INC.
815 Fourteenth Street N. W.

Telephone Main 673
Lanman Engraving Co.
HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS
POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

"Good Goods at Right Prices"
Meyer's Military Shops
1327 F STREET NORTHWEST
DR. JAEGER'S WOMEN'S SWEATER COATS
SPORT HATS, AUTO RUGS AND SCARFS
Prices Very Reasonable

Phone Main 8384 Toilet Articles
GERTRUDE CLEMENS
Expert Shampooing and Hairdressing
Room 232 Oxford Building, 726 14th Street N.W.
Manicuring—Hair Work Facial and Scalp Treatment
Open Evenings Until Seven

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.
OPEN 9:00 A. M.—CLOSE 5:45 P. M.
Christmas RIBBONS
Make Gifts Attractive *Tie Them With Ribbon*
Narrow Satin Taffeta Ribbons, in various colors, 10 yards in a piece.
Baby Ribbon, a piece 12c
No. 1½, a piece 15c
No. 2, a piece 19c
Red and green (holly colors), narrow width, piece of 10 yards at 12c
No. 1½, a piece of 10 yards 15c
Fancy Flowered Ribbons—
No. 1½, 10-yard piece, at 19c
No. 2, 10-yard piece, at 25c
Or a yard 4c
25c Fancy Dresden Ribbon, 5 inches wide, in light and dark colorings, a yard 19c
RIBBON STORE—STREET FLOOR